



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/650,709	05/20/96	ALBIN	7693-002-0

Q111/0412  
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND  
MAIER AND NEUSTADT  
FOURTH FLOOR  
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY  
ARLINGTON VA 22202

EXAMINER  
DEXTER, C

ART UNIT  
3724

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/12/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/650,709

Applicant(s)

Albin et al.

Examiner

Clark F. Dexter

Group Art Unit

3724



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 1, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 17-19, 21, 22, 26, and 27 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 17-19, 21, 22, 26, and 27 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152


--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3724

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment filed February 1, 1999 has been entered.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “depressions” as set forth in claim 27 must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. 

#### ***Specification***

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide clear support for the claim terminology. 37 CFR § 1.75(d)(1) requires that terms and phrases used in the claims find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. Specifically, the term “conveying device” as set forth in claim 26 (line 8) does not appear in the specification. ✓

Art Unit: 3724

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. Claims 17-19, 21, 22, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide sufficient support for “a conveying device” and its relationship to the cutting roll and the back up roll as now set forth in the claims, particularly claim 26 (line 8).

5. Claims 17-19, 21, 22, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 26, line 7, “hydrous polymer gel” is vague and indefinite as to whether it refers to that set forth in the preamble or to another such gel, and it seems that --said-- should be inserted before “hydrous” or the like; in line 8, structural cooperation is lacking for “a conveying device”; in lines 8-9, “a layer of hydrous polymer gel” is vague and indefinite as to whether it refers to the hydrous polymer gel previously set forth or to another such gel, and it seems that --said-- should be inserted before “hydrous” or the like.

In claim 18, line 2, the phrase “is planed or has the form of a sickle” is vague and indefinite since it is recited in the alternative and the alternative forms are not equivalents; further “is planed” is vague as to what structure is being set forth (is it intended to mean planar?).

Art Unit: 3724

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 17-19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heywood.

Heywood discloses a device, particularly in Figures 1-4, with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including a cutting roll (F or G-G') with axially extending cross-cutting elements (e.g., "e") and radially extending longitudinal cutting elements (e.g., "c" or "d" or "I"), and a back-up roll (C) which is approximately parallel to the cutting roll. However, Heywood lacks a conveying device that is driven separately from the cutting roll. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art to provide conveyors to move material from one work station (i.e., from storage, from a queue station, or from another processing apparatus) to another by independently driven conveyors to gain the benefits of automated operation (such as reduction of manpower) as well as the well known benefits of conveying

Art Unit: 3724

devices such as efficient and continuous movement of material. As is well known in the art, these conveyors can be driven at any desired speed to provide a desired spacing of the material during the material processing (i.e., the speed at which material moves from one apparatus to the next is often different than that of the material through any one of the apparatus). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide separately-driven conveyors to feed material to or from the device of Heywood for the well known benefits including those described above.

Regarding claim 17, Heywood discloses flat cross cutters but lacks a disclosure that the cross cutters are formed of flat steel polished on one side. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art to provide cutting blades made of polished steel to keep the blades free of contaminants and to provide a blade having a cleaner appearance. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the blades, including the cross cutters, of Heywood of polished steel for the well known reasons including those described above.

8. Claims 21, 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heywood as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Stream.

Heywood lacks the back-up roll being coated with plastic and further lacks depressions in the surface of the back-up roll. However, Heywood discloses that the back-up roll is covered with a soft material, specifically "rawhide or any other suitable material". Further, it is old and well known in the art to provide plastic on an anvil or back-up roll as evidenced by Stream to

Art Unit: 3724

enable the blade to press through the workpiece with sufficient pressure to cut the workpiece while not dulling the cutting edge of the blade. Plastic coating is clearly a modern alternative to a rawhide coating, and the specific types of plastic set forth are common forms of plastic. Further, the plastic coating of Stream forms depressions to receive the cutting edges of the blades of the cutter roller and Stream teaches that this establishes a strong traction between the cutter roll and the back-up roll and further prevents wear of the backup roll. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to replace the rawhide coating with plastic, particularly the notched coating of Stream, to gain the well known advantages of plastic including increased durability and reduced manufacturing costs as well as the advantages taught by Stream. Further, one having ordinary skill in the art would clearly select a common form of plastic for the well known benefits including availability.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3724

*Conclusion*

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at (703)308-2187.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers for this group are: formal papers - (703)305-3579; informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 USC 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [rinaldi.rada@uspto.gov].



Art Unit: 3724

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 USC 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Clark F. Dexter', written in a cursive style.

**Clark F. Dexter**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 3724**

cfid

April 12, 1999